arXiv:1605.03069v2 [math.PR] 11 Jun 2016

A PATHWISE ITERATIVE APPROACH TO THE EXTINCTION OF BRANCHING PROCESSES WITH COUNTABLY MANY TYPES

P. Braunsteins[†], **G. Decrouez**[♯] **and S. Hautphenne**[†,⋆]

[†] *The University of Melbourne*

[♯] *National Research University, Higher School of Economics, Moscow*
& ⋆Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne

p.braunsteins@student.unimelb.edu.au, ggdecrouez@hse.ru and sophiemh@unimelb.edu.au

Abstract – We consider the extinction events of Galton-Watson processes with countably infinitely many types. In particular, we construct truncated and augmented Galton-Watson processes with finite but increasing sets of types. A pathwise approach is then used to show that, under some sufficient conditions, the corresponding sequence of extinction probability vectors converges to the global extinction probability vector of the Galton-Watson processes with countably infinitely many types. This gives rise to a number of iterative methods for the computation of the global extinction probability vector.

Index terms – Multitype branching process, Extinction probability, Iterative method, Pathwise approach

1 Introduction

Multitype Galton-Watson branching processes (MGWBPs) are stochastic models describing the evolution of a population of individuals who live one unit of time and give birth to a random number of offspring that may be of various types. Each type may have a different progeny distribution, and individuals behave independently of each other. These processes have been studied extensively during the last decades; classical reference books include Harris [10], Mode [17], Athreya and Ney [1], and Jagers [14]. MGWBPs have numerous applications and have been used to model important problems arising in biology, ecology, physics and even computer science. Recent books with special emphasis on applications are Axelrod and Kimmel [2], and Haccou, Jagers and Vatutin [9].

One of the main topic of research on MGWBPs, and on branching processes in general, is the characterisation of the probability that the population eventually becomes empty. We denote by q_i the conditional extinction probability of the branching process, given that it starts with a single individual of type i, and we let $\boldsymbol{q} = (q_i)$. When the number of types is finite, it is well known that the vector $\boldsymbol{q}$ is the minimal non-negative solution of the fixed-point extinction equation,

$$\boldsymbol{s} = \boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{s}), \tag{1.1}$$

where $\boldsymbol{G}(\boldsymbol{s}) = (G_i(\boldsymbol{s}))$ records the progeny generating function associated with each type. Most of the time this system of equations cannot be solved analytically, but the linear functional iteration algorithm or the quadratic Newton algorithm can be applied to compute $\boldsymbol{q}$ numerically.

When the number of types is countably infinite, the extinction probability vector $\boldsymbol{q}$ is still the minimal non-negative solution of the fixed-point equation (1.1), however, it is generally unclear how to compute $\boldsymbol{q}$ as it now has infinitely many entries. Moreover, in that case we need to distinguish between different extinction events. We say that there is *global extinction* when the whole population becomes extinct, and $\boldsymbol{q}$ corresponds to the probability vector for this event, and we refer to the event that every type becomes extinct as *partial extinction*, and denote its probability vector by $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}$. The vector $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}$ also satisfies (1.1) but is not necessarily the minimal non-negative solution. It is clear that global extinction implies partial extinction but the converse does not necessarily hold; indeed, it is possible for every type to eventually disappear while the total number of individuals approaches infinity. Note that in the context of branching random walks (BRWs), which form a class of MGWBPs with countably many types, partial extinction is analogous to *local extinction* at every location.

Several authors investigated conditions for $\boldsymbol{q} = \mathbf{1}$ or $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}} = \mathbf{1}$ in a MGWBP with countably many types or in a BRW; see for instance [5, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24]. However, scant attention has been paid to computational aspects of the infinite extinction probability vectors $\boldsymbol{q}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}$, until the recent work in [11]. In that paper, the authors study two sequences of extinction probability vectors, $\{\boldsymbol{q}^{(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$ and $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$, converging respectively to $\boldsymbol{q}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}$, and whose kth element corresponds to the extinction probability of a related finite-type branching process constructed from the original process by replacing all types larger than k either by an immortal type (yielding $\boldsymbol{q}^{(k)}$), or by a sterile type (yielding $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}$). These are extreme situations where the replaced individuals either have an infinite line of descent (immortal), or no offspring (sterile). The objective of the present paper is to investigate the intermediate case where all types larger than k are replaced with a type randomly selected from the

set $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ according to some distribution $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}$; this defines a new sequence $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$ of extinction probability vectors that can be computed using established methods for MGWBPs with finitely many types.

Our results have clear parallels to those in [7, 8, 12], where the algorithmic computation of the stationary distribution of a recurrent infinite state Markov chain was considered, and our approach mirrors that of [12], in which the processes of interest were defined on a common probability space. More specifically, we define all branching processes on a common probability space allowing them to evolve together. We then isolate the points of difference between the processes for different values of k, and refer to these points as *seeds*. We study properties of the seed process for $k \geq 1$, as this process plays a key role in the asymptotic behaviour of $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$.

In our main theorem (Theorem 4.1), we prove that, under some sufficient conditions on the original MGWBP (closely related to the dichotomy property) and on the replacement distribution $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}$ (similar to a tightness condition), the sequence $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ converges to the global extinction probability $\boldsymbol{q}$. Additionally, we investigate the convergence properties of the sequence $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ for two specific replacement distributions previously considered in [7] and which do not satisfy the sufficient condition on $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}$: *(i)* replacement by the last type, that is, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_k$, and *(ii)* replacement by a uniformly distributed type, that is, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \mathbf{1}/k$. We consider one particular example in each case (Examples 2 and 3, respectively), and through these examples we demonstrate the contrasting asymptotic behaviour of $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$: in case *(i)*, we prove that the limit of the sequence does not always exist, however we show that in Example 2 the limit inferior does converge to the global extinction probability $\boldsymbol{q}$, whereas for Example 3 in case *(ii)*, the limit does exist but may correspond to the partial extinction probability $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}$.

The paper is organised as follows. The next section provides the background on MGWBP with countably many types. Section 3 focuses on the pathwise construction of the branching processes with corresponding extinction probabilities $\boldsymbol{q}^{(k)}$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}$, and $\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}$, and of an embedded branching process which will be used in all examples. In Section 4 we establish sufficient conditions for the convergence of $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ to $\boldsymbol{q}$, we study properties of the related seed process, and we prove the main theorem on the convergence of $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$. Finally, in Section 5 we study the asymptotic behaviour of $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ for two specific replacement distributions and provide some numerical examples.

2 Preliminaries

Consider a multitype Galton-Watson process with countably infinite type set $\mathcal{S} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$. Throughout the paper we assume that the process initially contains a single individual, whose type will be denoted as φ_0. The process then evolves according to the following rules:

(i) each individual lives for a single generation, and

(ii) at death it gives birth to $\boldsymbol{r} = (r_1, r_2, ...)$ offspring, that is, r_1 individuals of type 1, r_2 individuals of type 2, etc., where the vector $\boldsymbol{r}$ is chosen independently of all other individuals according to a probability distribution, $p_i(\cdot)$, specific to the parental type $i \in \mathcal{S}$.

Following Mode [17] we now give a more detailed but equivalent construction of this process which will be referred to throughout the remainder of the paper.

First consider the set of all possible individuals descending from an initial individual $\langle 0 \rangle$, that is, for $i_{(\cdot)} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j_{(\cdot)} \in \mathcal{S}$, consider all labels of the form $\langle i_1 j_1 \rangle$, $\langle i_1 j_1 i_2 j_2 \rangle$, $\dots$, $\langle i_1 j_1 i_2 j_2 \dots i_n j_n \rangle$, $\dots$. Each label is defined recursively and represents a line of descent from $\langle 0 \rangle$, that is, the individual $\langle i_1 j_1 i_2 j_2 \dots i_n j_n \rangle$ is a member of the nth generation and is the i_nth child of type j_n born to $\langle i_1 j_1 i_2 j_2 \dots i_{n-1} j_{n-1} \rangle$. For every positive integer n, let $\mathcal{J}_n$ be the set of all labels of the form $\langle i_1 j_1 i_2 j_2 \dots i_n j_n \rangle$, and let

$$\mathcal{J} = \langle 0 \rangle \cup \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{J}_n. \tag{2.1}$$

To each individual $I \in \mathcal{J}$ we associate a sample space $\Omega_I = (\mathbb{N}_0)^{\mathcal{S}}$, with $\mathbb{N}_0 = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, which is the set of all infinite vectors $\boldsymbol{r}_I$ with non-negative integer entries representing the number of offspring of the various types produced by the individual. Let $\mathcal{B}_I$ be the corresponding discrete σ-algebra, and let $\mathbf{P}_I$ be the probability measure such that $\mathbf{P}_I(B) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{r}_I \in B} p_i(\boldsymbol{r}_I)$ if I is of type i, for all $B \in \mathcal{B}_I$. The sequence of probability spaces $\{(\Omega_I, \mathcal{B}_I, \mathbf{P}_I)\}_{I \in \mathcal{J}}$ induces a product probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ on the product sample space $\Omega = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{J}} \Omega_I$, where $\mathcal{F} = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{J}} \mathcal{B}_I$ is the product σ-algebra, and $\mathbf{P}$ is the extension to $\mathcal{F}$ of the product probability $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{J}} = \prod_{I \in \mathcal{J}} \mathbf{P}_I$, following the Product Probability Theorem in Loève [16, page 91].

We now define the Galton-Watson branching process with countably many types on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$. The elements $\omega \in \Omega$ are of the form $\omega = (\boldsymbol{r}_I; I \in \mathcal{J})$ and represent possible outcomes of the process. Observe that each ω contains more information than is required because not

all members of $\mathcal{J}$ will appear in the population, which renders information about the potential offspring of these individuals redundant. We let $\boldsymbol{N}(\omega, I) = (N_1(\omega, I), N_2(\omega, I), \dots)$ be the number of offspring of the various types generated by individual I. The individual $I = \langle i_1 j_1 \dots i_n j_n \rangle$ then appears in the population if and only if,

$$i_1 \leq N_{j_1}(\omega, \langle 0 \rangle), i_2 \leq N_{j_2}(\omega, \langle i_1 j_1 \rangle), \dots, i_n \leq N_{j_n}(\omega, \langle i_1 j_1 \dots i_{n-1} j_{n-1} \rangle). \quad (2.2)$$

For every individual $I = \langle i_1 j_1 \dots i_n j_n \rangle \in \mathcal{J}_n$, let $Z_j(\omega, I) = 1$ if both $j_n = j$ and condition (2.2) are satisfied, and equal 0 otherwise. The population at generation n is then given by the vector $\boldsymbol{Z}_n(\omega)$ which has entries

$$Z_{n,j}(\omega) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{J}_n} Z_j(\omega, I), \quad j \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (2.3)$$

In the sequel, we will often drop the dependence in ω when it is not contextually important, and refer to the branching process as $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}_{n \geq 0}$. We let $|\boldsymbol{Z}_n| := \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} Z_{n,j}$ be the total population size at generation n.

From the set of probability distributions $\{p_i(\cdot)\}_{i \in \mathcal{S}}$ we define the *progeny generating function* $\boldsymbol{G} : [0,1]^{\mathcal{S}} \to [0,1]^{\mathcal{S}}$, which has entries,

$$G_i(\boldsymbol{s}) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{r} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^{\mathcal{S}}} p_i(\boldsymbol{r}) \boldsymbol{s}^{\boldsymbol{r}} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{r} \in (\mathbb{N}_0)^{\mathcal{S}}} p_i(\boldsymbol{r}) \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} s_k^{r_k}, \quad i \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (2.4)$$

The mean progeny matrix M is an infinite matrix whose entries are given by

$$M_{ij} = \left. \frac{\partial G_i(\boldsymbol{s})}{\partial s_j} \right|_{\boldsymbol{s}=\boldsymbol{1}}, \quad \text{for } i, j \in \mathcal{S},$$

where M_{ij} can be interpreted as the expected number of type j children born to a parent of type i. We assume that the row sums of M are finite, that is, the expected total number of direct offspring of an individual of any type is finite. It is sometimes convenient to associate a graph to the mean progeny matrix whose set of vertices corresponds to the set of types $\mathcal{S}$, and in which there is an oriented edge between nodes i and j with weight M_{ij} if and only if $M_{ij} > 0$. We shall refer later to this graph as the *mean progeny representation graph*. We say that there is a path from type i to type j if such a (directed) path exists in the mean progeny representation graph. The process $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ is *irreducible* if there is a path between every pair of nodes.

We distinguish between two types of extinction events: the *global* extinction event, $\{\lim_{n \to \infty} |\boldsymbol{Z}_n| = 0\}$, corresponding to the event that the whole population eventually becomes extinct; and the *partial* extinction event, $\{\forall l \geq 1 :$

$\lim_{n\to\infty} Z_{n,l} = 0\}$, corresponding to the event that all types eventually become extinct. Note that in the finite-type case, both events are equivalent. The conditional global extinction probability vector, given the initial type, is $\boldsymbol{q} = (q_1, q_2, \ldots)$, where

$$q_i = \mathbf{P}\left(\lim_{n\to\infty} |\boldsymbol{Z}_n| = 0 \mid \varphi_0 = i\right),$$

and the conditional partial extinction probability vector, given the initial type, is $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}} = (\tilde{q}_1, \tilde{q}_2, \ldots)$, where

$$\tilde{q}_i = \mathbf{P}\left(\forall l \geq 1 : \lim_{n\to\infty} Z_{n,l} = 0 \mid \varphi_0 = i\right).$$

It is clear that global extinction implies partial extinction, that is, $\boldsymbol{q} \leq \tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}$. The vectors $\boldsymbol{q}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}$ are both solutions to the fixed point equation (1.1). Additionally, $\boldsymbol{q}$ is the minimal non-negative solution of (1.1), whereas $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}$ is not necessarily the minimal non-negative solution. Moyal [20, Lemma 3.3] proved that, when $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ is irreducible and $\inf_i q_i > 0$, Equation (1.1) has at most one solution satisfying $\sup_i s_i < 1$, which corresponds to $\boldsymbol{q}$. Under more general conditions, Spataru [21, Theorem 3] stated that Equation (1.1) has at most two solutions, $\boldsymbol{q}$ and $\mathbf{1}$. However, the authors of [5] showed the inaccuracy of the latter by providing an irreducible example such that $\boldsymbol{q} < \tilde{\boldsymbol{q}} < \mathbf{1}$; in addition, more recently in [6], the same authors constructed an example which satisfies Moyal's conditions and has infinitely many solutions $\boldsymbol{s} < \mathbf{1}$ such that $\sup_i s_i = 1$.

For later use, we define for any $k \geq 1$ the partition $T_k := \{1, 2, ..., k\}$ and $T_k^c := \{k+1, k+2, ...\}$ of the set of types $\mathcal{S} = \{1, 2, 3, ...\}$, and we let

$$\tau_k(\omega) = \inf\left\{n \geq 0 : \sum_{i=k+1}^{\infty} Z_{n,i}(\omega) > 0\right\}$$

be the first passage time to T_k^c. Note that for each $\omega \in \Omega$, $\{\tau_k(\omega)\}_{k\geq 1}$ forms a increasing sequence in k.

3 Pathwise construction of finite-type branching processes on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$

3.1 Truncations and augmentations of $\{\mathbf{Z}_n\}$

In [11] the authors constructed two sequences of vectors, $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{q}^{(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$, which correspond to the extinction probabilities of some branching processes $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}_{n\geq 0}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}\}_{n\geq 0}$, and converge to the partial and global extinction

probabilities of $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}$ and $\boldsymbol{q}$, respectively. We construct $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}\}$ on the same probability space as $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ by specifying their sample paths for each $\omega \in \Omega$. This construction plays a key role in the remainder of the paper.

The first branching process, $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$, is a truncated process constructed such that to each realisation of $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ corresponds a realisation of $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ obtained by removing all descendants of type-i individuals, for $i \in T_k^c$. That is, for the process $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$,

(i) all types in T_k have the same progeny as the corresponding types in $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$, and

(ii) all types in T_k^c almost surely die with no offspring; these types are said to be *sterile*.

More specifically, for each $\omega \in \Omega$ and individual $I = \langle i_1 j_1 \dots i_n j_n \rangle \in \mathcal{J}$ of type $j = j_n$, we let

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{N}}^{(k)}(\omega, I) = \begin{cases} \boldsymbol{N}(\omega, I), & j \le k \\ \boldsymbol{0}, & j > k. \end{cases}$$

The individual then appears in the truncated branching process if and only if

$$i_1 \le \tilde{N}_{j_1}^{(k)}(\omega, \langle 0 \rangle), \;\; i_2 \le \tilde{N}_{j_2}^{(k)}(\omega, \langle i_1 j_1 \rangle), \;\; \dots, \;\; i_n \le \tilde{N}_{j_n}^{(k)}(\omega, \langle i_1 j_1 \dots i_{n-1} j_{n-1} \rangle). \tag{3.1}$$

We define $\tilde{Z}_j^{(k)}(\omega, I)$ which takes value 1 if I is of type j and condition (3.1) is satisfied, and 0 otherwise. The vector $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}(\omega)$ then has entries $\tilde{Z}_{n,j}^{(k)}(\omega) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{J}_n} \tilde{Z}_j^{(k)}(\omega, I)$.

We denote by $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}$ the global extinction probability vector of $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$. Since all types larger than k are sterile in $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$, the truncated process behaves effectively like a finite-type branching process on the set of types $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$. It is clear that $\tilde{q}_i^{(k)} = 1$ for all $i > k$, so the computation of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}$ reduces to solving a finite system of k equations. It was shown in [11] that the sequence $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ is monotone decreasing and converges pointwise to $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}$.

The second branching process, $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}\}$, is a truncated and augmented process constructed pathwise from realisations of the original process $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ by removing all individuals of type $i \in T_k^c$ and their descendants, and replacing each pruned branch with an absorbing type Δ which cannot become extinct. Essentially, in $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}\}$,

(i) all types in T_k have the same progeny distribution as the corresponding types in $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$, and

(ii) all types in T_k^c are instantaneously replaced by the absorbing type Δ, which at each generation produces a single type Δ progeny with probability one.

More formally, for each $\omega \in \Omega$, the population size vector $\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}(\omega)$ has entries

$$Z_{n,i}^{(k)}(\omega) = \begin{cases} \sum_{j=0}^{n} \sum_{l=k+1}^{\infty} \tilde{Z}_{j,l}^{(k)}(\omega), & i = \Delta \\ \tilde{Z}_{n,i}^{(k)}(\omega), & 1 \leq i \leq k \\ 0, & i > k. \end{cases}$$

Once a type Δ individual is born, $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}\}$ does not become extinct. In this sense, individuals of type Δ can be thought of as *immortal*. We denote by $\boldsymbol{q}^{(k)}$ the global extinction probability vector of $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}\}$; it contains only finitely many non-zero entries since $q_i^{(k)} = 0$ for all $i > k$. It is clear that $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}\}$ becomes extinct if and only if $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ becomes extinct before the birth of the first individual with a type in T_k^c. It is proved in [11] that the sequence $\{\boldsymbol{q}^{(k)}\}$ is monotone increasing and converges pointwise to $\boldsymbol{q}$.

We now use a similar pathwise approach to define a third sequence of branching processes from the original $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$, and in the next sections we study the convergence properties of the associated sequence of extinction probabilities. For each $k \geq 1$, we construct the truncated and augmented branching process $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}_{n\geq 0}$ for which

(i) all types in T_k have the same progeny distribution as the corresponding types in $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$, and

(ii) all types in T_k^c are instantaneously, and independently of each other, replaced by type $X \in \{1, ..., k\}$ which is selected using the probability distribution $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}$. The replaced individual then generates new individuals according to the progeny distribution of its type.

We construct the sample paths of $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}_{n\geq 0}$ for each $\omega \in \Omega$. To do this we first augment the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ to carry the sequence of independent random variables $\{X_l^{(k)}(I)\}_{l,k\in\mathbb{N},I\in\mathcal{J}}$. For each $k \geq 1$, these random variables take values in $\{1, \ldots, k\}$ and have probability distribution $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = (\alpha_1^{(k)}, \alpha_2^{(k)}, \ldots, \alpha_k^{(k)})$, where $\alpha_i^{(k)} = \mathbf{P}(X_l^{(k)}(I) = i)$. We interpret $X_l^{(k)}(\omega, I)$ as the replacement type of the lth offspring of type strictly larger than k born to I for the realisation ω. Let $N_{(k,\infty)}(\omega, I) = \sum_{j=k+1}^{\infty} N_j(\omega, I)$ and define $\bar{\boldsymbol{N}}^{(k)}(\omega, I)$ with entries,

$$\bar{N}_i^{(k)}(\omega, I) = \begin{cases} N_i(\omega, I) + \sum_{l=1}^{N_{(k,\infty)}(\omega,I)} \mathbf{1}\{X_l^{(k)}(\omega, I) = i\}, & 1 \leq i \leq k \\ 0, & i > k. \end{cases}$$



Figure 1: *A visualisation of* $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$, $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(2)}\}$, $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(2)}\}$ *and* $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(2)}\}$ *corresponding to a specific realisation* $\omega \in \Omega$. *It is such that* $\boldsymbol{r}_{\langle 0\rangle} = \boldsymbol{e}_2 + \boldsymbol{e}_3$, $\boldsymbol{r}_{\langle 12\rangle} = \boldsymbol{e}_4$, $\boldsymbol{r}_{\langle 13\rangle} = \boldsymbol{e}_1 + \boldsymbol{e}_4$, $\boldsymbol{r}_{\langle 1311\rangle} = \boldsymbol{e}_4$, $\boldsymbol{r}_{\langle 1314\rangle} = \boldsymbol{e}_2 + \boldsymbol{e}_3$ *and* $\boldsymbol{r}_{\langle 1214\rangle} = \boldsymbol{r}_{\langle 131114\rangle} = \boldsymbol{r}_{\langle 131412\rangle} = \boldsymbol{r}_{\langle 131413\rangle} = \boldsymbol{0}$ *are used to construct* $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$, $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(2)}\}$ *and* $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(2)}\}$, *and additionally* $X_1^{(2)}(\omega, \langle 0\rangle) = 1$, $\boldsymbol{r}_{\langle 11\rangle} = \boldsymbol{0}$, $X_1^{(2)}(\omega, \langle 12\rangle) = 1$, $\boldsymbol{r}_{\langle 1211\rangle} = \boldsymbol{e}_1 + \boldsymbol{e}_2$ *and* $\boldsymbol{r}_{\langle 121111\rangle} = \boldsymbol{r}_{\langle 121112\rangle} = \boldsymbol{0}$ *are used to construct* $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$. *All other information contained in* ω *is not required.*

Individual I then appears in the truncated and augmented branching process if and only if

$$i_1 \leq \bar{N}_{j_1}^{(k)}(\omega, \langle 0\rangle), \;\; i_2 \leq \bar{N}_{j_2}^{(k)}(\omega, \langle i_1 j_1\rangle), \;\; \ldots, \;\; i_n \leq \bar{N}_{j_n}^{(k)}(\omega, \langle i_1 j_1 \ldots i_{n-1} j_{n-1}\rangle). \tag{3.2}$$

We define $\bar{Z}_j^{(k)}(\omega, I)$ which takes value 1 if I is of type j and condition (3.2) is satisfied, and value 0 otherwise. Then $\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}(\omega)$ has entries,

$$\bar{Z}_{n,j}^{(k)}(\omega) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{J}_n} \bar{Z}_j^{(k)}(\omega, I).$$

An illustration of $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$, $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$, $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}\}$ and $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ is given in Figure 3.1 for $k = 2$ and a specific $\omega \in \Omega$. Note that $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(2)}\}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(2)}\}$ are both functions of $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ whereas in $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(2)}\}$ there are two subtrees with root 1, constructed using information redundant in $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$, in place of the two sterile individuals in $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(2)}\}$.

We denote by $\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}$ the global extinction probability vector of $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$. The vector $\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}$ contains infinitely many entries, and is such that for all $i > k$, $\bar{q}_i^{(k)} = \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j^{(k)} \bar{q}_j^{(k)}$; this represents the probability that the daughter process of a replaced individual becomes extinct, and will be denoted by $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} := \sum_{j=1}^k \alpha_j^{(k)} \bar{q}_j^{(k)}$ in the sequel. The computation of $\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}$ again reduces to finding the the extinction probability vector of a MGWBP with a finite type set. To

our knowledge, this branching process has not been considered in the literature, and the goal of the next section is to determine sufficient conditions for the convergence of the sequence $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}_{k\geq 1}$ to $\boldsymbol{q}$. Unlike the sequences $\{\boldsymbol{q}^{(k)}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$, the convergence of the sequence $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ may not be monotone. We show in the next lemma that $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ is however always caught between $\{\boldsymbol{q}^{(k)}\}$ and $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$.

Lemma 1. *For any $k \geq 1$ and replacement distribution $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}$,*

$$\boldsymbol{q}^{(k)} \leq \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} \leq \tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}.$$

Proof. From the pathwise construction of the branching processes, it is clear that

$$\{\omega : \lim_{n\to\infty} |\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}(\omega)| = 0\} \subseteq \{\omega : \lim_{n\to\infty} |\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}(\omega)| = 0\} \subseteq \{\omega : \lim_{n\to\infty} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}(\omega)| = 0\},$$

and the result follows. □

Corollary 1. *For any sequence $\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\}$ of replacement distributions,*

$$\boldsymbol{q} \leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} \leq \limsup_{k\to\infty} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} \leq \tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}.$$

Proof. The result is immediate by Lemma 1 since $\boldsymbol{q}^{(k)} \to \boldsymbol{q}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} \to \tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}$. □

A consequence of Corollary 1 is that, when it exists, the limit of the sequence $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ can only overestimate the probability of global extinction. In Section 4.1, we illustrate a situation where $\boldsymbol{q} < \lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} < \tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}$.

3.2 The embedded type-i branching process

In the three examples that we consider, we make use of a process considered in [24, Theorem 4.1] and [3, Theorem 4.1] which we define for any multitype branching process $\{\boldsymbol{V}_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ with type set $\mathcal{S}_V \subseteq \mathcal{S}$. We refer to this process as the *type-i branching process embedded with respect to* $\{\boldsymbol{V}_n\}_{n\geq 0}$ and use the notation $\{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})\}_{n\geq 0}$. The sample paths of $\{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})\}$ are constructed from those of $\{\boldsymbol{V}_n : \varphi_0 = i\}$ by taking all type-i individuals that appear in $\{\boldsymbol{V}_n\}$ and defining the direct descendants of these individuals as their closest (in generation) type-i descendants in $\{\boldsymbol{V}_n\}$. See Figure 2 for an illustration of this construction. A more formal construction of $\{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})\}$ for each $\omega \in \Omega$ is possible but requires the notion of a reproduction trail [24, Section 3.1]; we do not go into detail here. The process $\{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})\}$ behaves marginally as a (single-type) Galton-Watson process. Importantly, on a set of probability one, the extinction event

of $\{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})\}$ is equivalent to the event that type i becomes extinct in $\{\boldsymbol{V}_n\}$. Consequently, type i survives with positive probability in $\{\boldsymbol{V}_n\}$ if and only if the mean number of offspring in $\{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})\}$ is strictly greater than 1, that is,

$$m_{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})} := M_{ii} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{i_1,\ldots,i_{n-1} \in \mathcal{S}\setminus\{i\}} M_{ii_1} M_{i_1 i_2} \ldots M_{i_{n-1} i} \right) > 1.$$

Observe that $m_{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})}$ can be identified as the weighted sum of all first return paths to i in the mean progeny representation graph associated with the branching process $\{\boldsymbol{V}_n\}$. In the irreducible case, if $|\mathcal{S}_V| < \infty$, then

$$m_{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})} \leq 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \rho(M) \leq 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \boldsymbol{q} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{q}} = \mathbf{1},$$

where $\rho(M)$ denotes the Perron-Frobenius eigenvalue of the mean progeny matrix M; if $|\mathcal{S}_V| = \infty$, then

$$m_{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})} \leq 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \nu(M) \leq 1 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \tilde{\boldsymbol{q}} = \mathbf{1},$$

where $\nu(M)$ denotes the convergence norm of M; see for instance [24].

We shall make use of these facts in Examples 1, 2 and 3. Additionally, in Example 1 we shall use this process in a slightly different way, by noting that if $G_{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})}(\cdot)$ is the progeny generating function of $\{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})\}$ then the probability that type i becomes extinct in $\{\boldsymbol{V}_n\}$ is the minimal non-negative solution of the extinction equation

$$x = G_{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})}(x)\,, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq 1. \tag{3.3}$$

In general, an explicit expression for $G_{E_n^{(i)}(\boldsymbol{V})}(\cdot)$ may be difficult to derive, however there are particular cases where it can be obtained, as in Example 1.

4 Sufficient conditions for the convergence of $\{\bar{q}^{(k)}\}$ to q

In this section, we shall assume that the sequence of replacement distributions $\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\}$ satisfies a property slightly more general than tightness, that is,

Assumption 1. *There exist constants $N_1, N_2 \geq 1$ and $a > 0$, all independent of k, such that*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\min\{N_1,k\}} \alpha_i^{(k)} \geq a \qquad \textit{for all } k \geq N_2.$$



Figure 2: *A realisation of* $\{\boldsymbol{V}_n\}$ *(left) with the corresponding realisation of the type-*1 *process embedded with respect to* $\{\boldsymbol{V}_n\}$ *(right).*

Situations where Assumption 1 fails to hold include the case $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_k$, since for any N_1, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \alpha_i^{(k)} = 0$ for all $k \geq N_1 + 1$. The case $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \mathbf{1}/k$ also violates Assumption 1, since for any N_1, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \alpha_i^{(k)} \leq N_1/k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Special cases where Assumption 1 does not hold will be considered in Section 5. Replacement with a fixed type, however, satisfies Assumption 1; for example, when $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_1$, with $N_1 = 1$, $N_2 = 1$ and $a = 1$.

4.1 A motivating example

Assumption 1 alone is not a sufficient condition for the convergence of $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ to the global extinction probability $\boldsymbol{q}$, as we illustrate in the next example in which individuals are replaced by type 1 with probability one, corresponding to $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_1$.

Example 1. Consider a two-parameter irreducible branching process $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ with countably many types where, at death, type-1 individuals produce a single type-2 individual with probability $a > 0$ and no offspring with probability $1 - a$, and each type-$i \in \{2, 3, ...\}$ individual produces a single type-$(i + 1)$ offspring with probability one and a further Poisson$\big(b^{i-1}\big)$ type-1 individuals, where $0 < b < 1$. The progeny generating function of this process is thus given by

$$G_1(\boldsymbol{s}) = a\, s_2 + 1 - a,$$

and for $i \geq 2$,

$$G_i(\boldsymbol{s}) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{(b^{i-1})^k}{k!} e^{-b^{i-1}} s_1^k\, s_{i+1} = \exp\{b^{i-1}(s_1 - 1)\}\, s_{i+1}.$$



Figure 3: *The mean progeny representation graph corresponding to Example 1.*



Figure 4: *Differences in the extinction probabilities related to Example 1, plotted as a function of the parameters a and b. Left panel:* $z_1 = \tilde{q}_1 - q_1$. *Middle panel:* $z_2 = \lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{q}_1^{(k)} - q_1$. *Right panel:* $z_3 = \tilde{q}_1 - \lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{q}_1^{(k)}$.

The corresponding mean progeny representation graph is shown in Figure 3.

We assume that the population initially starts with one individual of type 1, that is, $\varphi_0 = 1$. Note that the probability of global extinction is $q_1 = 1 - a$ and $q_i = 0$ for all $i \geq 2$. Following Section 3.2, $\tilde{q}_1$ is equal to the extinction probability of the type-1 embedded process $\{E_n^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{Z})\}$, that is, $\tilde{q}_1$ is the minimal nonnegative solution to (3.3) with progeny generating function

$$G_{E_n^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{Z})}(x) = 1 - a + aF(x)\,, \quad \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq 1\,,$$

where $F(\cdot)$ is the probability generating function (p.g.f) of a sum of countably infinitely many independent Poisson random variables with respective parameters b^{i-1}, for $i \geq 2$, that is,

$$F(x) = \prod_{i\geq 2}^{\infty} \exp\{b^{i-1}(x-1)\} = \exp\{b(1-b)^{-1}(x-1)\}. \tag{4.1}$$

Hence $F(\cdot)$ is the p.g.f. of a Poisson random variable with parameter $b/(1-b)$. The corresponding mean progeny $m_{E_n^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{Z})} = ab/(1-b)$ indicates that $\tilde{q}_1 = 1$ if and only if $a \leq (1-b)/b$, in which particular cases $1 - a = q_1 < \tilde{q}_1$. The left panel in Figure 4 shows the difference $\tilde{q}_1 - q_1$ as a function of the parameter values.

Now consider the process $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_1$, and its conditional extinction probability $\bar{q}_1^{(k)}$, given that $\varphi_0 = 1$. This irreducible branching process has finitely many types, hence it becomes extinct if and only if type 1 becomes extinct, and $\bar{q}_1^{(k)}$ corresponds to the extinction probability of the type-1 process embedded with respect to $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$. The progeny generating function $G_{E_n^{(1)}(\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^{(k)})}(\cdot)$ of $\{E_n^{(1)}(\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^{(k)})\}$, that we denote by $G_{1,k}(\cdot)$ for short, is given by

$$G_{1,k}(x) = 1 - a + aF_k(x)x\,, \quad \text{for } 0 \le x \le 1\,,$$

where

$$F_k(x) = \prod_{i\ge 2}^{k} \exp\{b^{i-1}(x-1)\} = \exp\{b(1-b^{k-1})(1-b)^{-1}(x-1)\}$$

is the p.g.f of a Poisson random variable with parameter $b(1-b^{k-1})(1-b)^{-1}$. Note that here we multiply $aF_k(x)$ by x to account for the type $k+1$ descendant (instantaneously replaced by type 1) of each type 1 individual that has a type 2 offspring. By continuity of $G_{1,k}(\cdot)$, the limit $\bar{q}_1 := \lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{q}_1^{(k)}$ is the minimal nonnegative solution of

$$G_{1,\infty}(x) = 1 - a + aF(x)x,$$

where $F(x)$ is given in (4.1). The corresponding mean progeny $m_{1,\infty} = G'_{1,\infty}(1) = a(1 + b/(1-b)) = a + m_{E_n^{(1)}(\boldsymbol{Z})}$ indicates that $\bar{q}_1 = 1$ if and only if $a \le 1 - b$, in which particular cases $\bar{q}_1 > q_1 = 1 - a$. The middle panel in Figure 4 shows the difference $\bar{q}_1 - q_1$ as a function of the parameter values. This highlights the fact that the sequence $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ does not always converge to the global extinction probability $\boldsymbol{q}$.

For completeness, we also provide in the right panel of Figure 4 the difference $\tilde{q}_1 - \bar{q}_1$ as a function of the parameter values. From above, we have that if $a \le 1 - b$ then $q_1 < \tilde{q}_1 = \bar{q}_1 = 1$, so the sequence $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ can potentially converge to the partial extinction probability.

4.2 The seed process

Example 1 illustrates the need to further explore the conditions under which $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ converges to $\boldsymbol{q}$ as $k \to \infty$. The conditions which are established are closely related to dichotomy of the original process $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$. Observe that, for

any $k \geq 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{q}_i^{(k)} &= \mathbf{P}\left(\lim_{n\to\infty} |\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}| = 0 \,|\, \varphi_0 = i\right) \\
&= \mathbf{P}\left(\lim_{n\to\infty} |\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}| = 0\,,\, \lim_{n\to\infty} |\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}| = 0 \,|\, \varphi_0 = i\right) \\
&\quad + \mathbf{P}\left(\lim_{n\to\infty} |\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}| = 0\,,\, \lim_{n\to\infty} |\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}| > 0 \,|\, \varphi_0 = i\right) \\
&= q_i^{(k)} + \mathbf{P}\left(\lim_{n\to\infty} |\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}| = 0\,,\, \lim_{n\to\infty} |\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}| > 0 \,|\, \varphi_0 = i\right) \\
&= q_i^{(k)} + \sum_{x\geq 1} \left(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\right)^x \mathbf{P}\left(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| = x \,|\, \varphi_0 = i\right), \qquad (4.2)
\end{aligned}$$

where $|\boldsymbol{S}_k|$ denotes the (finite) number of sterile types produced over the lifetime of $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$, which are replaced by some random types in $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ and immortal types in $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}\}$. To understand Equation (4.2) one may think of simulating the branching processes with $\varphi_0 = i$ in two stages: by first constructing the path of $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$, and then constructing those of $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}\}$ and $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ by taking the outcome of $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$, replacing the sterile individuals, and simulating their daughter processes according to the respective replacement and updating rules. Conditional on the first stage of simulation, there are two ways in which $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ can die, either: (i) $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ dies before producing a sterile type, in which case $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}\}$ also dies (this occurs with probability $q_i^{(k)}$), or (ii) $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ dies after producing $1 \leq x < \infty$ sterile individuals, in which case $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ dies with probability $(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)})^x$ in the second stage of simulation. A formal definition of $\boldsymbol{S}_k$ is given below.

In Example 1 with $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_1$, we have $\bar{q}_1^{(k)} \geq 1 - a > 0$ for any $a < 1$, and for all $k \geq 1$,

$$\mathbf{P}\left(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| = 1 \,|\, \varphi_0 = 1\right) \geq a \sum_{l\geq 0} \mathbf{P}\left(X = l\right)(1-a)^l = F(1-a)\,, \qquad (4.3)$$

where X is the Poisson$(b/(1-b))$ random variable of the total number of direct type-1 children produced by an infinite line of descendants and $(1-a)^l$ is the probability that all l type-1 children produce no offspring. Therefore,

$$\mathbf{P}\left(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| = 1 \,|\, \varphi_0 = 1\right) \geq a e^{ab/(b-1)} > 0$$

for any $a > 0$ and $b < 1$, independently of k. Then, for any $k \geq 1$, (4.2) becomes

$$\bar{q}_1^{(k)} \geq q_1^{(k)} + \bar{q}_1^{(k)}\, \mathbf{P}\left(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| = 1 \,|\, \varphi_0 = 1\right) \geq q_1^{(k)} + (1-a)ae^{ab/(b-1)},$$

where the second term in the right-hand side is strictly positive. This shows that in Example 1, for any $0 < a, b < 1$,

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{q}_1^{(k)} > q_1.$$

This example generally indicates that, in order for $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ to converge to $\boldsymbol{q}$, we need to avoid cases where there is a positive probability that the number of sterile individuals produced over the lifetime of $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ remains positive and uniformly bounded for all k. A formal statement of this idea will be given in Lemma 4. We further investigate the behaviour of the number of these sterile individuals for different values of k, which we capture by formally introducing the *seed process* $\{\boldsymbol{S}_k\}_{k\geq 1}$, defined from the paths of $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$.

Definition 1. *The seed process* $\{\boldsymbol{S}_k = (S_{k,1}, S_{k,2}, ...)\}_{k\geq 1}$ *defined on* $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ *is such that for any* $\omega \in \Omega$, *if* $\lim_{n\to\infty} \tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}(\omega) = \mathbf{0}$, *then*

$$S_{k,i}(\omega) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } i \leq k, \\ \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tilde{Z}_{n,i}^{(k)}(\omega), & \text{if } i > k, \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

whereas, if $\lim_{n\to\infty} \tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}(\omega) > \mathbf{0}$, *then*

$$S_{k,i}(\omega) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i \geq 1. \tag{4.5}$$

We take the convention that $|\boldsymbol{S}_k| = 0$ when $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ does not become extinct in order to ensure that $\mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| < \infty) = 1$ for all fixed k. It is not hard to show that $\{\boldsymbol{S}_k\}$ forms a Markov chain on $\mathbb{N}^\infty$. More precisely, $\{\boldsymbol{S}_k\}$ is a branching process with countably many types, in which the progeny distribution depends on the generation (branching process in varying environment), and which can undergo catastrophes. During such a catastrophe, the whole population alive in generation k becomes extinct in generation $k+1$, not because all individuals of generation k produce no offspring, but if $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ becomes extinct while $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k+1)}\}$ does not become extinct. Like $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$, each outcome of $\{\boldsymbol{S}_k\}$ can be represented as a tree. An illustration of this is given in Figure 5 where an outcome of $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ is given along with the corresponding outcome of $\{\boldsymbol{S}_k\}$. Note that when $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ dies, individuals in the kth generation of the seed process with type strictly greater than $k+1$ produce only an exact copy of themselves, and the number of generations $\{\boldsymbol{S}_k\}$ lives is equivalent to the largest type produced in $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$.

We now study several properties of the seed process which will be useful to prove the main theorem on the convergence of $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ to $\boldsymbol{q}$ stated in the next subsection.



Figure 5: *A realisation of* $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ *(left). The corresponding seed process, as introduced in Definition 1, is* $\boldsymbol{S}_0 = (1, 0, 0, \ldots)$, $\boldsymbol{S}_1 = (0, 1, 1, 0, 1, \ldots)$, $\boldsymbol{S}_2 = (0, 0, 2, 1, 1, \ldots)$, $\boldsymbol{S}_3 = (0, 0, 0, 3, 1, \ldots)$, $\boldsymbol{S}_4 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 2, \ldots)$ *and* $\boldsymbol{S}_5 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 0, \ldots)$. *The right graph illustrates the tree representation of* $\{\boldsymbol{S}_k\}$.

Lemma 2. *The state* $\mathbf{0}$ *is absorbing for the seed process* $\{\boldsymbol{S}_k\}$.

Proof. Suppose $\boldsymbol{S}_k(\omega) = \mathbf{0}$ for some $\omega \in \Omega$. Then either $\lim_{n\to\infty} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}(\omega)| > 0$ or $\lim_{n\to\infty} |\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}(\omega)| = 0$. In addition, by construction,

$$\{\omega : \lim_{n\to\infty} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}(\omega)| > 0\} \subseteq \{\omega : \lim_{n\to\infty} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k+1)}(\omega)| > 0\}$$

and

$$\{\omega : \lim_{n\to\infty} |\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}(\omega)| = 0\} \subseteq \{\omega : \lim_{n\to\infty} |\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k+1)}(\omega)| = 0\},$$

which implies $\boldsymbol{S}_{k+1}(\omega) = \mathbf{0}$. □

Additionally, we obtain an expression for the probability that $\{\boldsymbol{S}_k\}$ has reached the absorbing state by generation k in terms of the extinction probabilities of $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}\}$:

Lemma 3. $\mathbf{P}\left(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| = 0 \,|\, \varphi_0 = i\right) = 1 - \tilde{q}_i^{(k)} + q_i^{(k)}$.

Proof. By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 2,

$$\mathbf{P}\left(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| = 0 \,|\, \varphi_0 = i\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(\left\{\lim_{n\to\infty} |\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}| > 0\right\} \cup \left\{\lim_{n\to\infty} |\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(k)}| = 0\right\} \,|\, \varphi_0 = i\right),$$

where the two events are mutually exclusive. □

This provides us with a condition for the global and partial extinction to coincide,

Corollary 2. *For all $i \geq 1$, the following two statements are equivalent*

(i) $q_i = \tilde{q}_i$

(ii) $\mathbf{P}\left(\lim_{k\to\infty} |\boldsymbol{S}_k| = 0 \,|\, \varphi_0 = i\right) = 1.$

We now return to our main focus which is to establish conditions under which $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ converges to $\boldsymbol{q}$. Since $\boldsymbol{q}^{(k)} \to \boldsymbol{q}$, we see that $\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} \to \boldsymbol{q}$ is equivalent to $\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} - \boldsymbol{q}^{(k)} \to \mathbf{0}$, and we focus on deriving conditions under which the latter statement holds true. We rewrite equation (4.2) as

$$\bar{q}_i^{(k)} - q_i^{(k)} = \mathbf{E}\left(\left(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\right)^{|\boldsymbol{S}_k|} - \mathbf{1}\left\{|\boldsymbol{S}_k| = 0\right\} \,\middle|\, \varphi_0 = i\right). \tag{4.6}$$

It is clear from equation (4.6) that if $|\boldsymbol{S}_k|$ has a positive probability to remain in the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, B\}$ for some $B \in \mathbb{N}$ as $k \to \infty$ and if $\liminf_{k\to\infty} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} > 0$, then $\bar{q}_i^{(k)} - q_i^{(k)} \nrightarrow 0$. The next lemma formalises this.

Lemma 4. *Assume that there exists $B < \infty$ such that*

$$\liminf_{k\to\infty} \mathbf{P}(0 < |\boldsymbol{S}_k| < B \,|\, \varphi_0 = i) = \alpha > 0.$$

If, in addition, $\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\}$ satisfies Assumption 1 for some N_1 such that $q_j > 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, N_1\}$, then $\liminf_{k\to\infty} \bar{q}_i^{(k)} > q_i$.

Proof. Since $q_j^{(k)} \to q_j > 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, N_1\}$, there exists $\beta > 0$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for all $k > K$ and $j \in \{1, \ldots, N_1\}$, $q_j^{(k)} \geq \beta$. By Lemma 1, we also have $\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} \geq \boldsymbol{q}^{(k)}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence

$$\bar{q}_j^{(k)} \geq \beta \text{ for all } k > K \text{ and all } j \in \{1, \ldots, N_1\}.$$

It follows from Assumption 1 that for any $k > \max\{K, N_1, N_2\}$,

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} \geq \sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \alpha_j^{(k)}\bar{q}_j^{(k)} \geq \beta a > 0.$$

Then, by (4.6),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\liminf_{k\to\infty}\left(\bar{q}_i^{(k)} - q_i^{(k)}\right)\\
&\quad= \liminf_{k\to\infty}\mathbf{E}\left(\left(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\right)^{|\boldsymbol{S}_k|} - \mathbf{1}\left\{|\boldsymbol{S}_k|=0\right\}\,\middle|\,\varphi_0=i\right)\\
&\quad\geq \liminf_{k\to\infty}\mathbf{E}\left(\left(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\right)^{|\boldsymbol{S}_k|}\,\middle|\,\varphi_0=i,\,0<|\boldsymbol{S}_k|<B\right)\mathbf{P}\left(0<|\boldsymbol{S}_k|<B\,|\,\varphi_0=i\right)\\
&\quad\geq (\beta a)^B\alpha>0,
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof. □

Lemma 4 highlights the importance of providing sufficient conditions for the process $\{|\boldsymbol{S}_k|\}$ to satisfy the dichotomy property, that is as $k\to\infty$, with probability one, either $|\boldsymbol{S}_k|\to\infty$ or a value n exists for which $|\boldsymbol{S}_k|=0$ for all $k\geq n$. We will make use of Jagers [15, Theorem 2], stating that a sufficient condition for a sequence $\{X_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ of non-negative random variables, such that $\{X_n=0\}\subseteq\{X_{n+1}=0\}$, to satisfy the dichotomy property is that, for any x, there exists $\delta_x>0$ such that

$$\mathbf{P}(\exists\, n: X_n=0\,|\,X_1,\ldots,X_k)\geq\delta_x,\ \text{whenever } X_k\leq x. \tag{4.7}$$

We refer the reader to [9, Section 5.2] and to [22] for a more detailed discussion on dichotomy.

Assumption 2. *There exists $\beta>0$ such that*

$$\inf_i q_i\geq\beta.$$

In $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ the daughter processes of individuals alive at any generation evolve independently of one another. Therefore, under Assumption 2, we have

$$\mathbf{P}(\exists\, n: |\boldsymbol{Z}_n|=0\,|\,|\boldsymbol{Z}_1|,\ldots,|\boldsymbol{Z}_k|)\geq\beta^x>0\ \text{whenever } |\boldsymbol{Z}_k|\leq x, \tag{4.8}$$

from which the dichotomy property for $\{|\boldsymbol{Z}_n|\}$ follows. Assumption 2 is a commonly applied condition for a branching process with countably many types to satisfy the dichotomy property. Note that a slightly more general condition was provided in [23]. However, we choose to follow Assumption 2 because it can be easily related to the dichotomy of the seed process as we show now.

Lemma 5. *For any initial population $\boldsymbol{Z}_0=\boldsymbol{S}_0$, conditionally on $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ becoming extinct, $\{\boldsymbol{S}_k\}$ dies almost surely.*

Proof. If $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ dies, then $K = \sup\{l : \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(\boldsymbol{Z}_n)_l > 0\} < \infty$ a.s., which implies $\boldsymbol{S}_{K+1} = \mathbf{0}$ a.s. □

Next, we show that Assumption 2 is sufficient for the dichotomy of the seed process.

Lemma 6. *Suppose Assumption 2 holds, then with probability one, either* $|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \to \infty$ *as* $k \to \infty$*, or a value of* n *exists for which* $|\boldsymbol{S}_k| = 0$ *for all* $k \geq n$*.*

Proof. Whenever $|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \leq x$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(\exists\, n : |\boldsymbol{S}_n| = 0 \,|\, |\boldsymbol{S}_1|, \ldots, |\boldsymbol{S}_k|) &\geq \inf_{\substack{\boldsymbol{z}_k : |\boldsymbol{z}_k| \leq x \\ z_{k,1}, \ldots, z_{k,k} = 0}} \mathbf{P}(\exists\, n : |\boldsymbol{S}_n| = 0 \,|\, \boldsymbol{S}_k = \boldsymbol{z}_k) \\ &\geq \inf_{\boldsymbol{z}_0 : |\boldsymbol{z}_0| \leq x} \mathbf{P}(\exists\, n : |\boldsymbol{S}_n| = 0 \,|\, \boldsymbol{S}_0 = \boldsymbol{z}_0).\end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 5 and using Assumption 2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\inf_{\boldsymbol{z}_0 : |\boldsymbol{z}_0| \leq x} \mathbf{P}(\exists\, n : |\boldsymbol{S}_n| = 0 \,|\, \boldsymbol{S}_0 = \boldsymbol{z}_0) &\geq \inf_{\boldsymbol{z}_0 : |\boldsymbol{z}_0| \leq x} \mathbf{P}(\exists\, n : |\boldsymbol{Z}_n| = 0 \,|\, \boldsymbol{Z}_0 = \boldsymbol{z}_0) \\ &\geq \beta^x > 0.\end{aligned}$$

Condition (4.7) has therefore been satisfied and [15, Theorem 2] then yields the result. □

Corollary 3. *Suppose Assumption 2 holds, then for any arbitrary integer* $K \geq 1$ *and initial type* i*,*

$$\lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \geq K \,|\, \varphi_0 = i) = \tilde{q}_i - q_i.$$

Proof. Lemma 2 ensures that $\mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| > 0 \,|\, \varphi_0 = i)$ is monotone decreasing in k, therefore, for any i, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| > 0 \,|\, \varphi_0 = i) = c_i$ exists, and Lemma 3 shows that the limit is given by $c_i = \tilde{q}_i - q_i$. Moreover, by Lemma 6,

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \geq K \,|\, \varphi_0 = i) \\ &\qquad = \lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| > 0 \,|\, \varphi_0 = i) - \lim_{k \to \infty} \mathbf{P}(0 < |\boldsymbol{S}_k| < K \,|\, \varphi_0 = i) = c_i\,,\end{aligned}$$

independently of the choice of K. □

Remark 1. *While Assumption 2 ensures both* $\{|\boldsymbol{S}_k|\}$ *and* $\{|\boldsymbol{Z}_n|\}$ *satisfy the dichotomy property, we believe more generally that*

$$\mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{Z}_n| \to 0 \text{ or } \infty) = 1 \Rightarrow \mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_n| \to 0 \text{ or } \infty) = 1.$$

If this were true, then Assumption 2 could then be relaxed to "$\{|\boldsymbol{Z}_n|\}$ *satisfies the dichotomy property".*

4.3 Convergence of $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ to $\mathbf{q}$

In this section, we state the main theorem on the pointwise convergence of the sequence $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ to the global extinction probability $\boldsymbol{q}$. To obtain convergence, Equation (4.6) suggests that, conditionally on $\mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \to \infty) > 0$, one must show that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}$ is bounded away from 1 for all sufficiently large k. To prove this, we use a regenerative argument, which may break down for some replacement distributions $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}$, such as the ones presented in the next section.

For a fixed k, each seed in $\boldsymbol{S}_k$ corresponds to a sterile individual produced over the lifetime of $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$. To obtain $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$, these seeds are replaced, independently of each other, by new individuals whose types follow the distribution $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}$, and whose daughter processes themselves may be thought of as producing an i.i.d. number of new seeds, and so on. Thus, the process formed by taking all 'replaced' individuals from $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ which correspond to seeds, and connecting each of these individuals to its nearest replaced seed ancestor in $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$, is a multitype Galton-Watson process on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbf{P})$ with type space $T_k = \{1, \ldots, k\}$. We refer to this process as the *embedded replacement process*, and denote it as $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(e,k)}\}_{n\geq 0}$. In $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(e,k)}\}$, each child's type is chosen independently of the type of its parent and other siblings, and therefore the corresponding progeny generating function $\boldsymbol{G}^{(e,k)} : [0,1]^{T_k} \to [0,1]^{T_k}$ is such that

$$G_i^{(e,k)}(\boldsymbol{s}) = \sum_{x\geq 0} \left(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\boldsymbol{s}\right)^x \mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| = x | \varphi_0 = i), \quad i \in T_k. \tag{4.9}$$

We use the convention that $\boldsymbol{Z}_0^{(e,k)} \equiv \bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_0^{(k)}$, that is, we include the initial individual in $\boldsymbol{Z}_0^{(e,k)}$ regardless of whether it has been replaced. The embedded replacement process can be constructed pathwise for each $\omega \in \Omega$, but we omit the details here. Conditional on the initial type $\varphi_0 \in T_k$, for each $\omega \in \Omega$ we have $|\boldsymbol{Z}_1^{(e,k)}(\omega)| = |\boldsymbol{S}_k(\omega)|$. Figure 4.3 gives an illustration of the construction of $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(e,k)}\}$ when compared to the corresponding realisation of $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ when $k = 4$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(4)} = \boldsymbol{e}_1$. In Figure 4.3 the type 2 root is common to both processes and the black type-1 nodes represent individuals that have been replaced.

It is clear that if the embedded replacement process does not become extinct then neither does $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$. Thus,

$$\bar{q}_j^{(k)} \leq q_j^{(e,k)} \quad \text{for all } j \in T_k. \tag{4.10}$$

where $\boldsymbol{q}^{(e,k)}$ the extinction probability vector of $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(e,k)}\}$. We are now in a position to prove the main result on the pointwise convergence of the sequence $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\}$ to the global extinction probability $\boldsymbol{q}$.



Figure 6: *A realisation of* $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(4)}\}$ *(left) with the corresponding realisation of the* $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(e,4)}\}$ *(right) when* $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_1$*. The black nodes represent individuals with type greater than 4 which are immediately replaced with type 1.*

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. In addition, assume that there exists* N_1 *such that either*

(i) $\tilde{q}_j < 1$ *for all* $j \in \{1, \dots, N_1\}$*, or*

(ii) $\tilde{q}_j = 1$ *for all* $j \in \{1, \dots, N_1\}$*, and there is a path from any* $j \in \{1, \dots, N_1\}$ *to the initial type* i*.*

Then

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{q}_i^{(k)} \to q_i,$$

for any initial type i*.*

Proof. By (4.6), we have for any fixed $i \geq 1$, $k \geq 1$, and for any arbitrary integer $K \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{q}_i^{(k)} - q_i^{(k)} = \\ \mathbf{E}\left(\left(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\right)^{|\boldsymbol{S}_k|} \,\middle|\, \varphi_0 = i, 0 < |\boldsymbol{S}_k| < K\right)\mathbf{P}(0 < |\boldsymbol{S}_k| < K \,|\, \varphi_0 = i) \quad (4.11)\\ +\mathbf{E}\left(\left(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\right)^{|\boldsymbol{S}_k|} \,\middle|\, \varphi_0 = i, |\boldsymbol{S}_k| \geq K\right)\mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \geq K \,|\, \varphi_0 = i). \quad (4.12)\end{aligned}$$

Under Assumption 2, by Lemma 6 we get that for any $K \geq 1$, $\mathbf{P}(0 < |\boldsymbol{S}_k| < K \,|\, \varphi_0 = i) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$, so (4.11) vanishes as $k \to \infty$. It remains to show that (4.12) vanishes as well.

By Corollary 3, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \geq K \,|\, \varphi_0 = i) = c_i$ independently of the choice of K, where $c_i = \tilde{q}_i - q_i$. Thus we obtain

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty}\left(\bar{q}_i^{(k)} - q_i^{(k)}\right) \leq c_i \limsup_{k\to\infty}\left(\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}\right)^K. \quad (4.13)$$

We now prove that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}$ is bounded away from 1 for k sufficiently large whenever $c_i > 0$, assuming *(i)* and *(ii)* separately.

Assume that *(i)* holds. Then there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $L \geq 1$ such that for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, N_1\}$, and for all $k \geq L$, $\tilde{q}_j^{(k)} < 1 - \varepsilon$. Therefore, by Lemma 1, for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, N_1\}$ and $k \geq L$, we have $\bar{q}_j^{(k)} < 1 - \varepsilon$. It follows that for any $k > \max\{L, N_1\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} &= \sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \alpha_j^{(k)} \bar{q}_j^{(k)} + \sum_{j=N_1+1}^{k} \alpha_j^{(k)} \bar{q}_j^{(k)} \\
&< (1-\varepsilon) \sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \alpha_j^{(k)} + \sum_{j=N_1+1}^{k} \alpha_j^{(k)} \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{k} \alpha_j^{(k)} - \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \alpha_j^{(k)} \leq 1 - \varepsilon\, a,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Assumption 1. With this, (4.13) becomes

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \left(\bar{q}_i^{(k)} - q_i^{(k)} \right) < c_i \, (1 - \varepsilon\, a)^K,$$

and the result follows from Corollary 1 and by choosing K large enough.

Assume that *(ii)* holds. First observe that if $c_i = 0$ for all $i \geq 1$ in (4.13), then the result immediately follows. In the remainder of the proof we assume that there exists $i \geq 1$ such that $c_i > 0$, and we first show that this implies that $c_j > 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, N_1\}$. Indeed, let θ_i be the first time an individual of type i is born in $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$. Then, by assumption, $\mathbf{P}(\theta_i < \infty \,|\, \varphi_0 = j) > 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, N_1\}$. Next, we have

$$\mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \geq K \,|\, \varphi_0 = j) \geq \mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \geq K \,|\, \varphi_0 = j, \theta_i < \tau_k)\, \mathbf{P}(\theta_i < \tau_k \,|\, \varphi_0 = j).$$

In addition, if the process starts with one type-j individual and generates a type-i individual before a seed, then the total number of seeds would be larger than K if the type-i individual itself generates more than K seeds, that is,

$$\mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \geq K \,|\, \varphi_0 = i) \leq \mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \geq K \,|\, \varphi_0 = j, \theta_i < \tau_k),$$

so that

$$\mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \geq K \,|\, \varphi_0 = j) \geq \mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \geq K \,|\, \varphi_0 = i)\, \mathbf{P}(\theta_i < \tau_k \,|\, \varphi_0 = j).$$

Note that here we use the assumption $\tilde{q}_j = 1$ to avoid the possibility of catastrophe in the seed process. As $k \to \infty$, the last inequality becomes $c_j \geq c_i \, \mathbf{P}(\theta_i < \infty \,|\, \varphi_0 = j) > 0$, as required.

Now that we have shown $c_i > 0$ for some $i \geq 1$ implies $c_j > 0$ for all $j \in \{1, \ldots, N_1\}$, it remains to show that $c_i > 0$ implies $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}$ is bounded away from 1 for k sufficiently large. Since $c_j > 0$, it follows that for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists an integer W_j depending on K such that for all $k > W_j$,

$$\mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| \geq K | \varphi_0 = j) > c_j - \varepsilon. \tag{4.14}$$

Let $W = \max_{1 \leq j \leq N_1}\{W_j\}$, and $c = \min_{1 \leq j \leq N_1}\{c_j\} > 0$. With reference to (4.9) and (4.14), we observe that for any $k \geq \{W, N_1, N_2\}$, the process $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(e,k)} : \varphi_0 \in \{1, \ldots, N_1\}\}$ is then stochastically larger than the branching process $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(e,k,2)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ with type set $T_{N_1} := \{1, \ldots, N_1\}$ and progeny generating function $\boldsymbol{G}^{(e,k,2)} : [0,1]^{T_{N_1}} \to [0,1]^{T_{N_1}}$ such that, for any $i \in T_{N_1}$,

$$G_i^{(e,k,2)}(\boldsymbol{s}) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \alpha_j^{(k)} s_j + 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{N_1} \alpha_j^{(k)} \right)^K (c - \varepsilon) + 1 - (c - \varepsilon).$$

This corresponds to the branching process in which each individual has K offspring with probability $c - \varepsilon$ and 0 offspring otherwise, then the types of the offspring are assigned independently according to the possibly defective distribution $(\alpha_1^{(k)}, \ldots, \alpha_{N_1}^k)$ and individuals not assigned a type are immediately killed. Since $G_i^{(e,k,2)}(\cdot)$ is independent of i, $\{|\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(e,k,2)}|\}_{n \geq 0}$ behaves like a single-type Galton-Watson process, that is, it is locally isomorphic to a single-type branching process (see [24, Definition 4.2]). Combining this with the fact that by Assumption 1, $\sum_{i=1}^{N_1} \alpha_i^{(k)} \geq a$ for all $k \geq N_2$, we see that, for all $k \geq \max\{W, N_1, N_2\}$, $\{|\boldsymbol{Z}_n^{(e,k,2)}|\}$ is stochastically larger than the single-type branching process $\{Z_n^{(e,3)}\}_{n \geq 0}$ with progeny generating function

$$G^{(e,3)}(s) = (as + 1 - a)^K (c - \varepsilon) + 1 - (c - \varepsilon).$$

By taking $K > 2/(a(c - \varepsilon))$ in order to bound the mean progeny of $\{Z_n^{(e,3)}\}$ away from 1, we obtain $q_j^{(e,k)} \leq q_j^{(e,k,2)} \leq q^{(e,3)} < 1 - \gamma$ for any $k \geq \max\{W, N_1, N_2\}$, $j \in \{1, \ldots, N_1\}$, and for some $\gamma > 0$. Using the same argument as the one used when assuming *(i)* holds, we obtain $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} \boldsymbol{q}^{(e,k)} < 1 - \gamma a$, and therefore by (4.10),

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} \leq \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} \boldsymbol{q}^{(e,k)} < 1 - \gamma a$$

for k sufficiently large, which proves the result.

□



Figure 7: *The mean progeny representation graph corresponding to* $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ *when* k *is odd in Example 2.*

Remark 2. *If* $\{\boldsymbol{Z}_n\}$ *is irreducible, then (i) or (ii) immediately follows, but the converse is not true. Theorem 4.1 therefore holds in many reducible cases too. The conditions on* $\tilde{q}_j$ *are easy to verify since a simple criterion exists for partial extinction, see [11].*

5 Two specific replacement distributions

Theorem 4.1 proves that $\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} \to \boldsymbol{q}$ for a large class of replacement distributions $\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\}$. However, when $\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)}\}$ is chosen so that Assumption 1 does not hold one may not obtain $\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{q}$. In fact, as we demonstrate in the next two examples, this limit does not necessarily exist (Example 2), or does not necessarily converge to $\boldsymbol{q}$ (Example 3).

Example 2 (Replacement with type k). Let $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_k$ and consider a modified version of the example of [11, Section 5.1], in which the odd types are 'stronger' than the even types. That is, we assume $a, c > 0$, $d > 1$ and define

$$G_1(\boldsymbol{s}) = \frac{cd}{t}\, s_2^t + 1 - \frac{cd}{t},$$

and for $i \geq 2$,

$$G_i(\boldsymbol{s}) = \begin{cases} \dfrac{cd}{u}\, s_{i+1}^u + \dfrac{ad}{u}\, s_{i-1}^u + 1 - \dfrac{d(a+c)}{u} & \text{when } i \text{ is odd,} \\ \dfrac{c}{dv}\, s_{i+1}^v + \dfrac{a}{dv}\, s_{i-1}^v + 1 - \dfrac{(a+c)}{dv} & \text{when } i \text{ is even,} \end{cases}$$

where $t = \lceil dc \rceil + 1$, $u = \lceil d(c+a) \rceil + 1$ and $v = \lceil (c+a)/d \rceil + 1$.

When k is odd $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)}\}$ has the mean progeny representation graph given in Figure 7; when k is even, there is an equivalent graph. We consider the type-k process $\{E_n^{(k)}(\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^{(k)})\}$ embedded with respect to $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(k)} : \varphi_0 = k\}$, with mean progeny $m_{E_n^{(k)}(\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^{(k)})}$ that we denote by $\bar{m}^{(k)}$ for short. The limit of the sequence $\{\bar{m}^{(k)}\}$ does not generally exist, however its limit superior and inferior are finite when $ac \leq 1/4$, as we show in the next lemma.

Lemma 7. *The mean progeny of* $\{E_n^{(k)}(\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}^{(k)})\}$ *described in Example 2 satisfies*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{m}^{(2k+1)} = cd + \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1-4ac}\right) \text{ and } \lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{m}^{(2k)} = c/d + \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1-4ac}\right) \tag{5.1}$$

when $ac \leq 1/4$, *and* $\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{m}^{(k)} = +\infty$ *when* $ac > 1/4$.

Proof. We calculate $\bar{m}^{(k)}$ by taking the weighted sum of all first return paths to k in the mean progeny representation graph,

$$\bar{m}^{(k)} = \bar{M}_{k,k}^{(k)} + \bar{M}_{k,k-1}^{(k)}\bar{M}_{k-1,k}^{(k)} + \bar{M}_{k,k-1}^{(k)}\bar{M}_{k-1,k-2}^{(k)}\bar{M}_{k-2,k-1}^{(k)}\bar{M}_{k-1,k}^{(k)} + \dots.$$

Observe that the number of these paths, $k \to (k-1) \to \cdots \to (k-1) \to k$, with length $2(l+1) \leq 2(k-1)$ is given by the Catalan number,

$$C_l = \frac{1}{l+1}\binom{2l}{l}, \quad l \geq 0, \tag{5.2}$$

whereas, because no path can fall below type 1, the number of paths is less than C_l when $2(l+1) > 2(k-1)$. In these expressions, $(l+1)$ can be interpreted as the total number of negative increments in the paths. Furthermore, the length of each first return path is even, the total number of positive and negative increments of each first return path is equal and each first return path alternates between odd and even states. Hence,

$$\bar{M}_{k,k}^{(k)} + \sum_{l=0}^{k-2} C_l\,(ac)^{l+1} \leq \bar{m}^{(k)} \leq \bar{M}_{k,k}^{(k)} + \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} C_l\,(ac)^{l+1}\,.$$

The infinite series converges when $ac \leq 1/4$ and diverges when $ac > 1/4$. In addition, when $ac \leq 1/4$,

$$\sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{l+1}\binom{2l}{l}(ac)^l = \frac{1}{2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1-4ac}\right),$$

which gives the result. □

As a consequence of Lemma 7, $\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{m}^{(2k+1)} - \bar{m}^{(2k)} = c(d - d^{-1})$, which indicates it is possible to choose a, c and d so that as $k \to \infty$, $\bar{m}^{(k)}$ oscillates between values less than 1 and greater than 1. This observation leads us to the following result.

Theorem 5.1. *Consider the branching process described in Example 2. Assume that* $d > 1$ *and that* $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_k$. *Then* $\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{q}$ *when* $ac > 1/4$. *Additionally,* $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}} = \mathbf{1}$ *if and only if* $ac \leq 1/4$, *and when this is satisfied,*

(i) if $d^{-1} > \left(1+\sqrt{1-4ac}\right)/2c$ *then* $\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{q}$,

(ii) if $d^{-1} \leq \left(1+\sqrt{1-4ac}\right)/2c < d$ *then*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(2k+1)} = \boldsymbol{q} \quad \textit{and} \quad \lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(2k)} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{q}} = \mathbf{1},$$

(iii) if $d \leq \left(1+\sqrt{1-4ac}\right)/2c$ *then* $\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{q}} = \boldsymbol{q} = \mathbf{1}$.

Proof. Following an approach analogous to the proof of Proposition 5.1 in [11], we can show that the convergence norm of the mean progeny matrix M is $\nu(M) = 2\sqrt{ac}$. By Proposition 4.1 in [11], we see that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}} = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if $ac \leq 1/4$.

We first turn our attention to cases *(i)* and *(ii)*. Observe that the number of first return paths to k of any fixed length is monotone increasing with k. This means that the sequences $\{\bar{m}^{(2k+1)}\}$ and $\{\bar{m}^{(2k)}\}$ are monotonically increasing with respect to k. Due to the repetitive structure of the progeny distributions and the relative weakness of type 1 with respect to other odd types, we also have

$$\bar{q}_{2k+1}^{(2k+1)} \geq \bar{q}_{2k+3}^{(2k+3)} \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{q}_{2k}^{(2k)} \geq \bar{q}_{2k+2}^{(2k+2)},$$

for all $k \geq 1$. If $\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{m}^{(2k+1)} > 1$, then there exists $\varepsilon_1 > 0$ and an integer k_1 such that for all $k \geq k_1$,

$$\bar{q}_{2k+1}^{(2k+1)} < 1 - \varepsilon_1, \tag{5.3}$$

whereas, if $\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{m}^{(2k+1)} \leq 1$ then, for all $k \geq 1$,

$$\bar{q}_{2k+1}^{(2k+1)} = 1. \tag{5.4}$$

An equivalent result holds when we take the limit over the even values of k.

Next, we have $\inf_i q_i \geq \inf_i p_{i\mathbf{0}} > 0$ which, by Lemma 6, implies that $|\boldsymbol{S}_k|$ satisfies the dichotomy property. Therefore, for any arbitrary integer $K \geq 1$,

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \left(\bar{q}_i^{(k)} - q_i^{(k)}\right) = c_i \limsup_{k\to\infty} \mathbf{E}\left(\left(\bar{q}_k^{(k)}\right)^{|\boldsymbol{S}_k|} \middle| |\boldsymbol{S}_k| > K, \varphi_0 = i\right),$$

where $c_i = \tilde{q}_i - q_i = \lim_{k\to\infty} \mathbf{P}(|\boldsymbol{S}_k| > K | \varphi_0 = i)$ by Corollary 3, with the same holding when lim sup is replaced by lim inf. In combination with (5.3) and (5.4) we then obtain

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \left(\bar{q}_i^{(2k+1)} - q_i^{(2k+1)}\right) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{m}^{(2k+1)} > 1, \\ \tilde{q}_i - q_i, & \text{if } \lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{m}^{(2k+1)} \leq 1 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\lim_{k\to\infty}\left(\bar{q}_i^{(2k)} - q_i^{(2k)}\right) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{m}^{(2k)} > 1, \\ \tilde{q}_i - q_i, & \text{if } \lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{m}^{(2k)} \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Use of the fact that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \boldsymbol{q}^{(k)} \to \boldsymbol{q}$ and Lemma 7 then provides the result.

Consider now case *(iii)*. We apply Proposition 4.5 in [11], which states that if there exists $\lambda \leq 1$ and a row vector $\boldsymbol{x} > \boldsymbol{0}$ such that $\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{1} < \infty$ and $\boldsymbol{x}M \leq \lambda \boldsymbol{x}$, then $\boldsymbol{q} = \boldsymbol{1}$. We let $\boldsymbol{x} = (x_i)_{i\geq 1}$ with $x_i = (\sqrt{d})^{(-1)^i}\, x^{1-i}$ for some $x > 0$. In this case, $\boldsymbol{x}M \leq \boldsymbol{x}$ is equivalent to $cx^2 + a \leq x$, that is, x belongs to the interval $[(1-\sqrt{1-4ac})/2c, (1+\sqrt{1-4ac})/2c]$. Moreover, $x > 1$ ensures $\boldsymbol{x}\boldsymbol{1} < \infty$. It follows that whenever $1 < (1+\sqrt{1-4ac})/2c$, there exists an x satisfying both conditions, which implies that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}} = \boldsymbol{q} = \boldsymbol{1}$. □

In Figure 8 we plot $\tilde{q}_1^{(k)}$ (black dashed), $q_1^{(k)}$ (grey dashed) and $\bar{q}_1^{(k)}$ for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_1$ (solid grey bold), $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{1}/k$ (solid black bold) and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_k$ (solid fine). In the top two plots we let $a = 1/6$ and $c = 7/8$, in which case $ac < 1/4$ and $\left(1+\sqrt{1-4ac}\right)/2c \approx 0.94$. With this in mind, we choose $d^{-1} = 0.95$ (panel (a)) and $d^{-1} = 0.93$ (panel (b)). In agreement with Theorem 5.1, for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_k$ we observe that $\bar{q}_1^{(k)} \to q_1$ when $d^{-1} = 0.95$, whereas $\bar{q}_1^{(2k+1)} \to q_1$ and $\bar{q}_1^{(2k)} \to \tilde{q}_1 = 1$ when $d^{-1} = 0.93$. For these values of a, c and d it appears that $q_1 < 1$, which lead us to conclude that $\liminf_{k\to\infty} \bar{q}_1^{(k)} \neq \limsup_{k\to\infty} \bar{q}_1^{(k)}$ when $d^{-1} = 0.93$ and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_k$. In panel (c) of Figure 8 we let $a = 1/3$ and $c = 13/16$, in which case $ac > 1/4$ so that $\tilde{q}_1 < 1$ for any value of d. We choose $d = 2$ and observe that all sequences converge to $q_1 = \tilde{q}_1$. In panel (d) of Figure 8 we let $a = 1/6$, $c = 13/16$ and $d = 2$, which means $ac < 1/4$ and $d^{-1} < \left(1+\sqrt{1-4ac}\right)/2c \approx 1.03 < d$, which entails that for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_k$, $\bar{q}_1^{(2k+1)} \to q_1$ and $\bar{q}_1^{(2k)} \to \tilde{q}_1$. However, in this case $\tilde{q}_1 = q_1 = 1$ and thus the limit of $\bar{q}^{(k)}$ exists.

Observe that for the branching process described in Example 2, Theorem 5.1 implies that when $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{e}_k$, then $\liminf_{k\to\infty} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{q}$. The next example indicates that when $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{1}/k$ and $\inf_i q_i < 1$, there is not always a subsequence of $\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)}$ that converges to $\boldsymbol{q}$.

Example 3 (Replacement with a uniform type). For ease of notation, in this example we use the type set $\mathcal{S} = \{2, 3, 4, \dots\}$. Suppose $p, \varepsilon \in (0,1)$ and $3p\varepsilon^2 < 1$, and consider the following progeny distribution:

$$G_2(\boldsymbol{s}) = p\, s_4^3 + (1-p),$$



Figure 8: *Sequences of extinction probabilities* $\tilde{q}_1^{(k)}$, $q_1^{(k)}$ *and* $\bar{q}_1^{(k)}$ *for different replacement distributions and different parameters values, corresponding to Example 2. Details are given the text.*



Figure 9: *The mean progeny representation graph corresponding to Example 3.*

and for $i \geq 3$,

$$G_i(\boldsymbol{s}) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon p(1-3p\varepsilon^{i/2})\, s_{i-1}\, s_{2i}^3 \\ \quad +p(1-3p\varepsilon^{i/2})(1-\varepsilon)\, s_{2i}^3 \\ \quad\quad +\varepsilon(1-p(1-3p\varepsilon^{i/2}))\, s_{i-1} \\ \quad\quad\quad +(1-\varepsilon-p(1-3p\varepsilon^{i/2})(1-\varepsilon)), & \text{if } i \in \{2^l\}_{l\geq 2}, \\ \varepsilon\, s_{i-1} + (1-\varepsilon) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The corresponding mean progeny representation graph is shown in Figure 9.

Theorem 5.2. *For the branching process described in Example 3,*

(i) $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}} = \mathbf{1}$,

(ii) if $p > 1/3$ *then* $\boldsymbol{q} < \mathbf{1}$, *and*

(iii) if $p < 2/3$ *and* $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \mathbf{1}/k$, *then* $\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} = \mathbf{1}$.

Proof. To prove *(i)*, we consider the type-2^k process embedded with respect to $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(2^k)} : \varphi_0 = 2^k\}$, and calculate its mean number of offspring, denoted by $\tilde{m}^{(2^k)}$, for $k \geq 1$. We tackle this by computing the weighted sum of all first return paths to node 2^k in the mean progeny representation graph illustrated in Figure 9, which we alter by removing all nodes greater than 2^k to account for the corresponding types being sterile in $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(2^k)}\}$. Observe that when $k = 2$, $(2^k = 4)$ there is a single first return path $4 \to 3 \to 2 \to 4$, thus, $\tilde{m}^{(4)} = 3p\varepsilon^2$. When $k > 2$, we calculate $\tilde{m}^{(2^k)}$ recursively as follows. First observe that each first return path to 2^k begins with the sequence of edges $2^k \to (2^k - 1) \to \cdots \to (2^{k-1} + 1) \to 2^{k-1}$, and ends with the edge $2^{k-1} \to 2^k$. Additionally,

the remainder of each path (or the midsection) can be partitioned into the first return paths that were summed to obtain $\tilde{m}^{(2^{k-1})}$. That is, for the purpose of calculating $\tilde{m}^{(2^k)}$, in the mean progeny matrix representation graph, nodes of type $< 2^{k-1}$ can then be replaced by a loop to type 2^{k-1} with weight $\tilde{m}^{(2^{k-1})}$. See Figure 10(a) for an illustration when $k = 3$. It can then be shown that,

$$\tilde{m}^{(2^k)} = \varepsilon^{2^{k-1}} \left[1 + \tilde{m}^{(2^{k-1})} + (\tilde{m}^{(2^{k-1})})^2 + \dots\right] 3p(1 - 3p\varepsilon^{2^{k-2}}).$$

We can then prove by induction that $\tilde{m}^{(2^k)} = \varepsilon^{2^{k-1}} 3p$, which leads to $\tilde{m}^{(2^k)} < 1$ for all $k \geq 1$ since, by assumption, $3p\varepsilon^{(2^{k-1})} \leq 3p\varepsilon^2 < 1$. Combining this with the fact that for all $k \geq 2$, $\{\tilde{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(2^k)}\}$ is irreducible, we obtain $\tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(2^k)} = \mathbf{1}$ for all $k \geq 1$. Since $\{2^k\}_{k\geq 1}$ is an infinite subsequence of $\mathbb{N}$, the result then follows from the fact that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{q}}$.

We now prove *(ii)*. If $p > 1/3$, then there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that $p = 1/3 + \gamma$, and there exist an integer N and a constant $0 < C < 3\gamma$ such that $3p(1 - 3p\varepsilon^{i/2}) = (1 + 3\gamma)(1 - 3p\varepsilon^{i/2}) > 1 + C$ for all $i \geq 2^N$ (since $3p\varepsilon^{i/2}$ becomes arbitrarily close to 0 as i increases). By disregarding all types j such that $j \leq 2^N$ or $j \notin \{2^k\}_{k\geq 2}$ it can be shown that $\{|\boldsymbol{Z}_n| : \varphi_0 = 2^N\}$ is stochastically greater than the Galton-Watson process with progeny generating function $G(s) = (1/3 + C/3)s^3 + (2/3 - C/3)$. Since $G'(1) > 1$, we have $q_{2^N} < 1$. The result follows from irreducibility.

To prove *(iii)* we consider the type-2^k process embedded in $\{\bar{\boldsymbol{Z}}_n^{(2^k)} : \varphi_0 = 2^k\}$ and calculate its mean number of offspring $\bar{m}^{(2^k)}$. To account for the instantaneous replacement of all individuals of type $> 2^k$ with a type uniformly distributed on $\{2, \dots, 2^k\}$, the graph illustrated in Figure 9 is altered by removing all nodes greater than 2^k and adding an edge of weight $3p(1-3p\varepsilon^{2^{k-1}})/(2^k-1)$ from node 2^k to all the remaining nodes. See Figure 10(b) for an illustration when $k = 3$. We then calculate the weighted sum of all first return paths to 2^k. Note that these paths include those involved in the computation of $\tilde{m}^{(2^k)}$. More specifically, if we let $f_{i,k}$ be the weighted sum of all first passage paths from 2^i to 2^k, then

$$\bar{m}^{(2^k)} = \tilde{m}^{(2^k)} + \frac{3p(1 - 3p\varepsilon^{2^{k-1}})}{2^k - 1} \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} f_{k-j,k} \left(\sum_{i=0}^{2^{k-j}-1} \varepsilon^i\right)\right).$$

By applying a recursive argument analogous to the proof of *(i)*, it can then be

shown that $f_{i,k} = (3p)^{k-i}$. Assuming $p \neq 1/3$ we have,

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{m}^{(2^k)} &= 3p\varepsilon^{2^{k-1}} + \frac{3p(1-3p\varepsilon^{2^{k-1}})}{2^k-1}\left(1 + \frac{1}{1-\epsilon}\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}(3p)^j(1-\varepsilon^{2^{k-j}})\right) \\ &\leq 3p\varepsilon^{2^{k-1}} + \frac{3p}{2^k-1}\left(\frac{1-(3p)^k}{(1-3p)(1-\varepsilon)} + \epsilon\right) \to 0 \quad \text{as } k \to \infty\end{aligned}$$

when $p < 2/3$. When $p = 1/3$ it can be shown that an equivalent result holds. This demonstrates that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{m}^{(2^k)} = 0$ when $p < 2/3$. The proof that $\bar{m}^{(k)} \to 0$ is an extension of the same method and is omitted. Therefore, there exists an integer N such that for all $k > N$, $\bar{m}^{(k)} < 1$ hence $\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} = \mathbf{1}$, which shows that $\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} \to \mathbf{1}$ as $k \to \infty$. □

When $p > 2/3$, one can show that $\bar{m}^{(k)} \to \infty$; while this implies $\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} < \mathbf{1}$ for all $k \geq 1$, it alone does not rule out the case where $\bar{\boldsymbol{q}}^{(k)} \to \mathbf{1}$. We now give a numerical example to further explore the cases $1/3 < p < 2/3$ and $p > 2/3$.

In Figure 11 we plot the first entry of each sequence of extinction probability vectors for the branching processes described in Example 3 with two different sets of values of p and ε. In the upper panel of Figure 11 we let $p = 1/2$ and $\varepsilon = 1/2$. In this case, $1/3 < p < 2/3$ and in agreement with Theorem 5.2 we have $\bar{q}_1^{(k)} \to \tilde{q}_1 \neq q_1$ for $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{(k)} = \mathbf{1}/k$. In the lower panel we take $p = 7/9$ and $\varepsilon = 1/2$. In this case, $p > 2/3$, and Theorem 5.2 does not provide any information about the convergence of $\bar{q}_1^{(k)}$, however, simulations indicate that $\bar{q}_1^{(k)} \to q_1 < 1$.

6 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to acknowledge the support of the Australian Research Council (ARC) through the Centre of Excellence for the Mathematical and Statistical Frontiers (ACEMS). Sophie Hautphenne would further like to thank the ARC for support through Discovery Early Career Researcher Award DE150101044.

References

[1] Athreya, K.B. and Ney, P.E. (1972). *Branching Processes*. Springer, Berlin.



Figure 10: *A visual representation of the mean progeny matrix in Example 3. Bold edges in (b) have weight* $\frac{3p(1-3p\varepsilon^4)}{7}$.



Figure 11: *Sequences of extinction probabilities* $\tilde{q}_1^{(k)}$, $q_1^{(k)}$ *and* $\bar{q}_1^{(k)}$ *for different replacement distributions and different parameters values, corresponding to Example 3. Details are given the text.*

[2] Kimmel, M. and Axelrod, D.E. (2002). *Branching Processes in Biology.* Springer, New York.

[3] Bertacchi, D. and Zucca, F. (2009). Characterization of critical values of branching random walks on weighted graphs through infinite-type branching processes. *Journal of statistical physics.* 134.1: 53-65.

[4] Bertacchi, D. and Zucca, F. (2013). Recent results on branching random walks. *Statistical Mechanics and Random Walks: Principles, Processes and Applications, Nova Science Publishers.* 289-340

[5] Bertacchi, D. and Zucca, F. (2014). Strong local survival of branching random walks is not monotone. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 46.2: 400-421.

[6] Bertacchi, D. and Zucca, F. (2016). A generating function approach to branching random walks. To appear on the *Brazilian Journal of Probability and Statistics.*

[7] Gibson, D. and Seneta E. (1987). Augmented truncations of infinite stochastic matrices. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 600-608.

[8] Gibson, D. and Seneta E. (1987). Monotone infinite stochastic matrices and their augmented truncations. *Stochastic processes and their applications*, 24.2: 287-292.

[9] Haccou, P., Jagers, P. and Vatutin, V. A.. (2005). *Branching processes: variation, growth, and extinction of populations.* No. 5. Cambridge University Press.

[10] Harris, T. E. (2002) *The theory of branching processes.* Courier Corporation.

[11] Hautphenne, S., Latouche, G. and Nguyen, G. (2013). Extinction probabilities of branching processes with countably infinitely many types. *Advances in Applied Probability*, 45.4: 1068-1082.

[12] Heyman, D. P., and Whitt, W.(1989). Limits for queues as the waiting room grows. *Queueing Systems*, 5.4: 381-392.

[13] Heyman, D. P.(1991). Approximating the stationary distribution of an infinite stochastic matrix. *Journal of Applied Probability*, 96-103.

[14] Jagers, P. *Branching Processes with Biological Applications.* Wiley, London, 1975.

[15] Jagers, P. (1992) Stabilities and instabilities in population dynamics. *Journal of applied probability*, 29: 770-780.

[16] Loève, M. (1955). *Probability Theory; Foundations, Random Sequences.* New York: D. Van Nostrand Company.

[17] Mode, C.J. (1971). *Multitype Branching Processes.* Elsevier, New York.

[18] Moy, S.-T. C. (1966). Ergodic properties of expectation matrices of a branching process with countably many types. *J. Math. and Mech.* **16,** 1201–1225.

[19] Moy, S.-T. C. (1967). Extensions of a limit theorem of Everett, Ulam and Harris on multitype branching processes to a branching process with countably many types. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **38,** 992–999.

[20] Moyal, J. E. (1962). Multiplicative population chains. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences* **266,** 518–526.

[21] Spataru, A. (1989). Properties of branching processes with denumerably many types. *Revue Roumaine de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées (Romanian Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics)*, 34: 747-759.

[22] Steel, M. (2015). Reflections on the extinction-explosion dichotomy. *Theoretical population biology*, 101: 61-66.

[23] Tetzlaff, G. T. (2004). Criticality in unbounded-types branching processes. arXiv preprint math/0402156.

[24] Zucca, F. (2011). Survival, extinction and approximation of discrete-time branching random walks. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 142.4: 726-753.